Case 5:11-cv-02057-LHK Document 151 Filed 04/10/13 Page 2 of 2

1	As a general rule, a district court should stay discovery until the issue of qualified
2	immunity is resolved. See Crawford-El v. Britton, 523 U.S. 574, 598 (1998); Harlow v.
3	Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982). Accordingly, Defendants' motion to stay discovery is
4	hereby GRANTED . (Docket No. 137.) Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery is DENIED .
5	(Docket No. 117.)
6	In the interest of justice, Plaintiff's request for an extension of time in which to file an
7	opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss is GRANTED . Plaintiff shall file an opposition to
8	Defendants' motion to dismiss within twenty-eight (28) days of the filing date of this order.
9	Defendants' shall file a reply within fourteen (14) days of the filing date of Plaintiff's
10	opposition.
11	To the extent that Plaintiff requests the Court to appoint counsel in his motion for Court
12	appointed expert witness and his motion to inform the Court of Plaintiff's circumstances, the
13	request is DENIED for want of changed circumstances. (Docket Nos. 127 and 142.)
14	This order terminates docket numbers 117, 127, 137 and 142.
15	IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 4/9/13
16	DATED: 4/9/13
17	United State District Judge
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	Order Granting Motion to Stay Discovery; Granting Motion for Extension of Time; Denying Motions for Appointment of Counsel G:\PRO-SE\SJ.LHK\CR.11\Patten057misc2.wpd

2